

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ BLACK BORDERS
- ☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- ☐ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- ☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
- ☐ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
- ☐ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
- ☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY
- ☐ OTHER: _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.

Rel



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/818,367

03/27/2001

Yaniv Feinberg

60001.0025US01/MS154668.1

1651

27488

7590

10/06/2004

MICROSOFT CORPORATION
 C/O MERCHANT & GOULD, L.L.C.
 P.O. BOX 2903
 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

HUYNH, THU V

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/818,367

Applicant(s)

FEINBERG, YANIV

Examiner

Thu V Huynh

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 14 and 15 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 9-13, 16 and 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 7, 8, 17, 18, 20 and 21 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)^a
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 05/21/01.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2178

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: IDS filed on 05/21/2001 and application filed on 03/28/01.
2. Claims 1-21 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 6, 13-15 and 19 are independent claims.

Double Patenting

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

3. Claim 11 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of Claim 10. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2178

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claim 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hydes et al., US 4,203,102, patented 1980.

Regarding independent claim 1, Hydes teaches the steps of:

- scanning a text section for a portion of the text selection that must be rendered differently than other portions of the text selection according to text rendering rules of the language to which the text selection belongs (Hydes, col.1, lines 41-54 and col.4, lines 24-40);
- marking the beginning of the portion of the text selection (Hydes, col.3, lines 56-68 and fig.4, inserting attribute character for subsequent alphanumeric character);
- marking the end of the portion of the text selection (Hydes, col.3, lines 56-68 and fig.4, end of the subsequent alphanumeric character is beginning of next attribute character); and
- rendering the portion of the text selection differently than other portions of the text selection according to the rules of the language to which the text selection belongs (Hydes, col.4, lines 24-35).

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Hydes teaches scanning a text selection for a portion of the text selection that must be rendered differently than other portions of the text selection according to text rendering rules of the language to which the text selection belongs, further includes the steps of:

Art Unit: 2178

- locating a first character indicating a beginning of the portion of the text selection
(Hydes, col.3, lines 56-68 and fig.4; locating first character in order inversing and displaying)
- locating a second character indicating an end of the portion of the text selection
(Hydes, col.3, lines 56-68 and fig.4; locating end character in order inversing and displaying).

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 2, Hydes teaches the portion of the text selection must be rendered in left-to-right character ordering and whereby the other portions of the text selection must be rendered in a right-to-left character ordering according to the rules of the language to which the text selection belongs (Hydes, col.3, lines 56-68; col.1, lines 41-54 and col.4, lines 24-40).

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, teaches the language to which the text selection belongs is Hebrew (Hydes, col.4, lines 24-35).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

(b) This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the

Art Unit: 2178

time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1-6, 9-13, 16 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniel et al., US 5,784,069, patented 07/1998 in view of Hydes et al., US 4,203,102, patented 1980.

Regarding independent claim 1, Daniel teaches the steps of:

- scanning a text selection for a portion of the text selection that must be rendered differently than other portions of the text selection according to text rendering rules of a language (Daniels, col.2, line 65 – col.3, line 11; col.3, line 61 – col.4, line 9 and col.6, lines 1-6; scanning an input text for text elements that must be rendered in different direction, such as scanning input text string that intermixes Hebrew with Roman text to determined the directions of text elements);
- marking the beginning of the portion of the text selection (Daniel, col.8, lines 50-60; marking a current text element);
- marking the end of the portion of the text selection (Daniel, col.8, lines 50-60; marking end of text element);
- rendering the portion of the text selection differently than other portions of the text selection according to the rules of the language (Daniel, col.1, lines 4-8; col.7, lines 6-9; and col.9, lines 32-35; display the generated text wherein Hebrew and Latin texts' directions are "right to left" and "left to right" respectively).

Art Unit: 2178

However, Daniel does not explicitly disclose scanning and displaying the text must be rendered in different from other text according to text rendering rules of the language to which the text selection belongs.

Hydes teaches:

- scanning a text section for a portion of the text selection that must be rendered differently than other portions of the text selection according to text rendering rules of the language to which the text selection belongs (Hydes, col.1, lines 41-54 and col.4, lines 24-40; In Hebrew language, numbers appear in “left to right” direction although letters appear in “right to left” direction); and
- rendering the portion of the text selection differently than other portions of the text selection according to the rules of the language to which the text selection belongs (Hydes, col.4, lines 24-40).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Hydes’ teaching and Daniel to provide directions for text elements in different languages as well as in a same language, since this would have provided the user correct format to read bi-directional text, as Hydes mentioned.

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1. The combination of Daniel and Hydes teaches scanning a text selection for a portion of the text selection that must be rendered differently than other portions of the text selection according to text rendering rules of the language to which the text selection belongs as explained above.

Daniel teaches the steps of:

Art Unit: 2178

- locating a first character indicating a beginning of the portion of the text selection (Daniel, col.8, lines 50-60 and col.9, lines 41-35); and
- locating a second character indicating an end of the portion of the text selection (Daniel, col.8, lines 50-60 and col.9, lines 41-35).

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 2, Daniel does not explicitly teaches the portion of the text selection must be rendered in left-to-right character ordering and whereby the other portions of the text selection must be rendered in a right-to-left character ordering according to the rules of the language to which the text selection belongs.

Hydes teaches the portion of the text selection must be rendered in left-to-right character ordering and whereby the other portions of the text selection must be rendered in a right-to-left character ordering according to the rules of the language to which the text selection belongs (Hydes, col.3, lines 56-68; col.1, lines 41-54 and col.4, lines 24-40).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Hydes' teaching into Daniel to displaying numbers in left-to-right direction whereby text is displayed in right-to-left direction for Hebrew language, since such displaying would have provided the user correct format to read Hebrew language (bi-directional), as Hydes mentioned.

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, Daniel teaches the language to which the text selection belongs is Hebrew (Daniel, col.9, lines 20-35).

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent on claim 2, the combination of Daniel and Hydes teaches rendering number in left-to-right direction and letters in right-to-left direction for Hebrew language as explained above. However, Daniel does not explicitly teach the first character is a hyphen.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have include a first character is a hyphen to render in “left-to-right” direction, since hyphen (-) is used with number to indicate a negative number.

Regarding independent claim 6, Daniel teaches the steps of:

- scanning a text section (Daniels, col.2, line 65 – col.3, line 11; col.3, line 61 – col.4, line 9 and col.6, lines 1-6; scanning an input text for text elements that must be rendered in different direction, such as scanning input text string that intermixes Hebrew with Roman text to determined the directions of text elements);
- locating a character indicating a beginning of a portion of text that may need to rendered in left-to-right reading order (Daniel, col.8, lines 50-60; marking a current text element wherein the text element is Roman);
- locating a second character indicating an end of the portion of text that may need to rendered in left-to-right reading order (Daniel, col.8, lines 50-60; marking an end text element wherein the text element is Roman);
- determining whether the portion of text must be rendered in left-to-right reading order (Daniel, col.3, lines 2-11 and col.4, lines 4-5; determining the direction for Roman text must be in left-to-right);

Art Unit: 2178

- rendering the portion of the text in left-to-right reading order (Daniel, col.1, lines 4-8; col.7, lines 6-9; and col.9, lines 32-35; display the generated text wherein Hebrew and Latin texts' directions are "right to left" and "left to right" respectively).

Daniel does not explicitly disclose the first element text indicating a beginning of text is a hyphen.

Daniel teaches Roman texts are read from left-to-right (Daniel, col.3, lines 2-11).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have include a first character is a hyphen to render in "left-to-right" direction in the input text string, since hyphen is one of Roman text.

Regarding dependent claim 9, which is dependent on claim 6, Daniel teaches scanning a text selection, includes scanning the text selection character by character (Daniel, col.4, lines 1-5).

Regarding dependent claim 10, which is dependent on claim 6, Daniel teaches scanning a text selection, includes scanning the text selection character by character (Daniel, col.4, lines 1-5). Daniel does not explicitly teach scanning the entire document.

However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill to the art at the time the invention was made to have recognized that Daniel's "source strings" (fig.3, item 302) are able to be sentences, paragraphs and documents as well as the purpose of "bidirectional code converter" (Daniel, title and abstract) for.

Regarding dependent claim 11, which is dependent on claim 6, Daniel teaches scanning a text selection, includes scanning the text selection character by character (Daniel, col.4, lines 1-5). Daniel does not explicitly teach scanning the entire document.

However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill to the art at the time the invention was made to have recognized that Daniel's "source strings" (fig.3, item 302) are able to be sentences, paragraphs and documents as well as the purpose of "bidirectional code converter" (Daniel, title and abstract) for.

Regarding dependent claim 12, which is dependent on claim 6, Daniel teaches scanning a text selection, includes scanning the text selection character by character (Daniel, col.4, lines 1-5). Daniel does not explicitly teach scanning plurality of documents.

However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill to the art at the time the invention was made to have recognized that Daniel's "source strings" (fig.3, item 302) are able to be sentences, paragraphs and documents as well as the purpose of "bidirectional code converter" (Daniel, title and abstract) for.

Regarding independent claim 13, Daniel teaches the steps of:

- scanning a selection of Hebrew text rendered in a right-to-left reading order (Daniels, col.2, line 65 – col.3, line 11; col.3, line 61 – col.4, line 9 and col.6, lines 1-6; scanning an input text for text elements wherein the input text is Hebrew text);
- marking the beginning of the portion of text (Daniel, col.8, lines 50-60; marking a current text element);

Art Unit: 2178

- marking the end of the portion of text (Daniel, col.8, lines 50-60; marking an end text element).

Daniel does not explicitly disclose determining whether a portion of the text must be rendered in a left-to-right reading order according to Hebrew text rendering rules and reversing the reading order of the portion of text such that the portion of text is rendered in left-to-right reading order.

Hydes teaches determining whether a portion of the text must be rendered in a left-to-right reading order according to Hebrew text rendering rules and reversing the reading order of the portion of text such that the portion of text is rendered in left-to-right reading order (Hydes, col.4, lines 24-40; rendering number in left-to-right direction although letters in right-to-left direction for Hebrew language).

Claim 16 is for a computer readable medium having stored computer program performing the method claim 6 and is rejected under the rationale.

Claim 19 is for a computer system performing the method claim 6 and is rejected under the rationale.

8. Claims 5-6, 16 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hydes, US 4,203,102, patented 1980.

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent on claim 2, Hydes does not explicitly disclose the first character is a hyphen.

Art Unit: 2178

Hydes teaches rendering number in left-to-right direction and letters in right-to-left direction for Hebrew language (Hydes, col.4, lines 24-40).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have include a first character is a hyphen to render in “left-to-right” direction, since hyphen (-) is used with number to indicate a negative number.

Regarding independent claim 6, Hydes teaches the steps of:

- scanning a text section (Hydes, col.1, lines 41-54);
- locating a character indicating a beginning of a portion of text that may need to rendered in left-to-right reading order (Hydes, col.4, lines 1-13);
- locating a second character indicating an end of the portion of text that may need to rendered in left-to-right reading order (Hydes, col.4, lines 1-13);
- determining whether the portion of text must be rendered in left-to-right reading order (Hydes, col.4, lines 1-13);
- rendering the portion of the text in left-to-right reading order (Hydes, col.4, lines 1-13);

Hydes does not explicitly disclose a hyphen character for a character indicating a beginning of the portion text. Hydes teaches Latin type languages are read from left to right (Hydes, col.1, lines 19-25) and rendering number in left-to-right direction and letters in right-to-left direction for Hebrew language (Hydes, col.4, lines 24-40).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have include a first character is a hyphen to render in “left-to-right”

Art Unit: 2178

direction, since hyphen is one of Latin character and/or hyphen (-) is used with number to indicate a negative number.

Claim 16 is for a computer readable medium having stored computer program performing the method claim 6 and is rejected under the rationale.

Claim 19 is for a computer system performing the method claim 6 and is rejected under the rationale.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 14-15 are allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the features of rendering a portion text in left-to-right reading order by marking a position of a hyphen character indicating a beginning of portion of text that need to be rendered in left-to-right reading order; determining whether the hyphen character has first and second numbers immediately adjacent to the first and second sides of the hyphen character respectively to mark the second number's position indicating an end of the portion of text that need to be rendered in left-to-right reading order are not shown and would not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention in view of the prior art of record.

10. Claims 7-8, 17-18 and 20-21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Atkin, US 2003/0110021 A1, filed 06/2001, teaches generalized mechanism for Unicode metadata.

Atkin, US 2003/0110021 A1, filed 06/2001, teaches bidirectional domain names.

Ng, US 5,812,122, filed 1995, teaches testing layout service for supporting complex text languages.

Gonzalez et al., US 6,204,782 B1, filed 1998, teaches Unicode conversion into multiple encodes.

Flam, US 2004/0039996 A1, priority filed 1999, teaches bidirectional network language support.

Gillam, US 6,513,002 B1, filed 1998, teaches rule-based number formatter.

Clissman et al., "The UNiVerse Project:state-of-the-ar of the standards, softwares and systems which will underpin the development. Part1:Z39.50; WWW Integration with X39.50; and Unicode", copyright 1997, page 1-10.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu V Huynh whose telephone number is (571) 273-4126. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

Art Unit: 2178

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S Hong can be reached on (571) 273-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TVH
September 24, 2004


**STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER**